

representatives and senators, professional engineer, mayor, and so forth. There is hardly a classification that you could name that is not among the mounting pile of letters I am receiving on the subject.

The following editorial from the Eastern Idaho Farmer, Idaho Falls, Idaho, classifies Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho as the "sort of thing which can make a shambles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States." The entire editorial follows:

[From the Eastern Idaho Farmer, May 30, 1963]

WHAT UDALL DID

For years we've been trying to say in these columns that the expansion of Federal Government in the United States is a threat to the liberty of American people. Gigantic appropriations, new bureaus and departments, laws and regulations pyramid into one inevitable result—centralized power. In the end, liberty flies out the window.

The point has been emphasized—in opposite directions—by two recent events of concern in Idaho. The two—the wheat referendum and Secretary Stewart Udall's order incorporating southern Idaho in the administrative area of the Bonneville Power Administration.

We are, at the moment, concerned with the latter because here is precisely what we've been talking about all these years.

It is astonishing how many people have said to us since Secretary Udall issued that BPA order:

"Can the Secretary do that? Can he, legally, do something like that by simply issuing an executive order?"

Certainly he can. We've pointed out, time and again, that it was not only possible but that, in all probability, it's exactly what Secretary Udall would do.

Well, he did it. We're not arguing here whether the action was right or wrong, good or bad, for Idaho. The point is that, after the most perfunctory investigation with only the sketchiest attempt to find out what Idaho people wanted, the executive order was issued.

That's government by edict. It's precisely the sort of thing which can make a shambles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It's government by men, not law.

In the light of all that, there's good reason to cheer wheat farmers who turned away from the possibility of dictation of the same order.

Mr. Speaker, the Times News, of Twin Falls, Idaho, lists its editorial on Secretary Udall's action under the heading, "He Needs Control." The editorial follows:

HE NEEDS CONTROL

When the House Interior Subcommittee voted to require congressional approval for a Federal power transmission line from the Pacific Northwest to California, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall started screaming. It's one of the few setbacks Secretary Udall has encountered since he started gobbling up territory for the Federal power monopoly. And it's high time someone started putting an end to his government by edict that was demonstrated so graphically by his arbitrary order extending the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area into southern Idaho.

The Secretary termed the subcommittee action "wholly unacceptable" and "anti-public interest," among other things. He might also learn his protests will fall on

deaf ears in Congress which usually reacts a little differently than an apathetic public which can show interest only when someone starts interfering with the individual's personal pleasures.

If Secretary Udall were to have his way, he would gallop the Nation down the socialistic road. He has demonstrated he's not the slightest bit interested in what's in the public interest and when he says something is "wholly unacceptable," he means unacceptable to Secretary Udall.

Politicians grabbing for powers have to be controlled somehow, in the public interest, and in the case of a Cabinet Secretary Congressmen must recognize their responsibility and live up to it, screams or no screams.

Mr. Speaker, the secretary of the Buhl Chamber of Commerce of Buhl, Idaho, indicates his liking for the slogan, "Bonneville, please include us out," as he begins his letter to me in that fashion. His letter follows:

BUHL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Buhl, Idaho, July 30, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: "Bonneville, please include us out."

I read your comments on Bonneville power which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am opposed to the inclusion of southern Idaho as a marketing area for Bonneville power and appreciate your efforts in trying to put some checks on the Bonneville Power Administration.

Yours truly,

L. E. BYRNE,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, a lawyer from Buhl, Idaho, commends me for my stand against Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho in the following words:

HEPWORTH & NUNGESTER,
Buhl, Idaho, August 2, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: I am writing to commend you on your approach to the extension of Bonneville power to southern Idaho. Unfortunately, Idaho has no one from our own State who is willing to represent the majority for us, at least as I have observed it, in southern Idaho. Most of us view this possible extension as a real threat to our irrigation rights and an obvious fraud on the citizens of the entire Nation. I will not elaborate further except to say that you have my personal thanks and I am sure the thanks of a great many people in southern Idaho for your stand on this problem.

Respectfully,

JOHN C. HEPWORTH.

And the owner of a tire store in McCall, Idaho, puts his thanks for my efforts as follows:

SONNY'S OK TIRE STORE,
McCall, Idaho, August 9, 1963.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: I have just read your report or statement as the case may be and think that BPA coming into Idaho is utterly ridiculous. I can see no other way but for it to cost us taxpayers money. Please put me on record of opposing BPA in Idaho or any place else for that matter.

I realize that my little voice will mean nothing as far as the masses are concerned but I am definitely against Federal power. For that matter Federal or Government business of any kind. If I practiced the methods of doing business the Government does I would have been broke in the first 6 months

of business. As it is I have managed to get by for nearly 8 years. Thank you for the effort you are putting forth to curtail such nonsense.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE A. LAWRENCE.

How Freedom Is Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the American people may lose their freedom and what is actually a dictatorship will be established without many people knowing that it has come about. Already the majority of our citizens are being subjected to regimentation that needs very little implementation to give the Federal Government complete control over the individual citizen.

In spite of the warning signals being flashed, far too few are concerned with saving freedom. Even those who recognize what is taking place somehow feel we can continue to build the pork barrel by larger and increased local projects and somehow keep free of the Federal spiderweb. Unfortunately, it would not work. As the Federal octopus grows it feeds upon the only thing it can feed upon, the freedom of the people.

How far we have come in losing our freedoms is shown in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of today, August 20, "A Creepy Sort of Service":

A CREEPY SORT OF SERVICE

It's fashionable these days to say that Government must grow as the population grows and society becomes more complex. Not only Government officials but many private individuals as well seem to regard a steady expansion of Government as an inescapable fact of contemporary life.

Actually there is no intrinsic or logical connection between population growth and Government girth. And before accepting such a connection too complacently it is well to reflect on its implications. Government growth means not only constantly increasing spending. It also has proved in practice to entail an even more rapid erosion of the citizen's privacy and free choice.

The specifics behind that generalization are both startling and chilling, as an article in the First National City Bank of New York's Letter amply attests. To begin with, the Letter notes that people are now compelled to pay more than \$150 billion a year in taxes to all levels of government.

On top of that are the "invisible" costs—the time required to prepare tax returns, the money corporations must spend to collect taxes for the government the development of a whole industry of tax advisers, the expense of the innumerable reports of all kinds demanded by government, a company's loss of money and respect as a result of litigation stemming from an often baseless accusation by some government agency.

These invisible costs are truly incalculable, but plainly enormous. What is even more striking is the arrogance and absurdity of many of the government requirements, the intimacy with which it is now involved in private activities, especially of business.

August 20

A5320

Item: In a recent year, Union Carbide Corp. had to file 3,600 forms—all relating just to taxes.

Item: In a recent year, a midwestern manufacturer reports that "the company handled 173 different Federal forms ranging in frequency of filing from daily to annual and involving the filing of 37,683 reports. The workload amounted to 48,285 hours. * * * Requests from State agencies which were compiled with included 63 different forms, involving the filing of 1,145 reports at a cost of 3,266 hours."

Item: In a recent year, the Association of American Railroads found it took 10 pages to give only the titles of 164 separate reports to Federal agencies, particularly the Interstate Commerce Commission, which ironically is one of the chief roadblocks to railroad improvement. That didn't include reports dealing with mail-handling. The estimated dollar cost of reporting to the ICC alone is more than \$5 million a year.

Much of this paperwork, for unregulated as well as regulated industries is useless; in fact, even today there aren't enough bureaucrats to wade through it all. Yet the trend is worsening. Financial institutions now have to file information on each account with interest payments of \$10 or more; all businesses have to keep carloads of meaningless records in case the Internal Revenue Service should ask for them in pursuit of its new rigmarole of rules for expense-account spending.

Anyone who thinks there is no trace of regimentation in all this would do well to think again. It may seem inconsequential that the IRS now treats people as computerized numbers or that it assumes that the individual is wrong if it questions his return, but it is symptomatic. Certainly it is not inconsequential that Federal agencies hold what amount to life-and-death powers over businesses, whether legally regulated or not.

The unpalatable but all too likely prospect is that the prying will intensify with the growth of Government, for it is the nature of bureaucracy to demand ever more minute details. The population growth itself will spur the urge to control, on the Government theory that so many more people naturally will make a mess of things if left to their own devices.

Officials love to talk about how they have to serve the needs of an expanding population. Apart from the incalculable cost and the incredible waste, what kind of service is it to take the people's substance and increasingly control their private lives?

Should Army Enforce Integration?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. EDWARD HEBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks now I have been among those who have attempted to bring national and congressional attention to the dangers inherent in the recent Defense Department directive conceived under the Gesell report.

I am pleased to note that more and more of the news media are taking interest in the issues behind the Gesell report and the subsequent directive.

In this connection, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent column by Warren Rogers, the chief

Washington correspondent for the Hearst newspapers.

Mr. Rogers is a veteran reporter, an expert on the Department of Defense, and a staunch advocate of civil rights. Nevertheless, Mr. Rogers was not misled by the red herrings thrown across the trail of the Defense Department directive. He views this report and directive as a "grave constitutional question of the division of power through checks and balances."

And, Mr. Rogers asks:

If the President can do this, of what use is Congress?

This is exactly the point in this case. It is indeed gratifying that a reporter of national stature such as Warren Rogers has grasped the threat posed by the Gesell report and the Defense Department directive.

I urge my colleagues to consider the counsel offered by Mr. Rogers in the following column, which appeared in the Albany, N.Y., Times-Union on August 14, 1963, and other Hearst newspapers:

SHOULD ARMY ENFORCE INTEGRATION?

(By Warren Rogers)

WASHINGTON.—It sometimes happens that, when a man pursues a noble goal, he is tempted to use tactics which in themselves are ignoble. In our society, we decry any succumbing to this temptation and properly so, because we do not believe that the end justifies the means.

We are witnessing an example now, in President Kennedy's use of the Armed Forces as one means to bring about the national goal of first-class citizenship for every American.

There are a number of things wrong with the Pentagon's adoption, with the full blessing of the President, of the Gesell report. Southerners in the House attacked it last week, for more than 4 hours last Wednesday, and it is too easy to dismiss their objections as simply another segregationist onslaught.

The Gesell report is named after Gerhard A. Gesell, a Washington lawyer serving as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. It was adopted, with a very few reservations, by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, and it is now gospel in the Armed Forces.

This means that military base commanders in the United States are now empowered to declare off limits to their personnel any business establishment anywhere that practices racial discrimination.

It also means that base commanders will be watched and graded—and therefore promoted or not promoted—on how efficiently they attempt to desegregate the communities in which their commands are located.

It means further that President Kennedy is not waiting for Congress to act on his controversial bill to outlaw segregation in public accommodations. He is achieving by Executive order, at least insofar as military personnel are concerned, the very thing that he conceded was the prerogative of Congress when he asked Congress to pass a public accommodations law.

Finally, adoption of the Gesell report threatens to destroy morale in the Armed Forces rather than to enhance it, which is its objective. This is because it sets up a special channel through which Negroes may complain of unfair treatment—thus, in effect, discriminating against white soldiers.

There is a heavyhandedness, a damn-the-torpedoes arrogance implicit in the way the President and the Secretary of Defense have suddenly sprung the sweeping directive. It is characteristic of the Kennedy-McNamara approach to military policy, what with the

now-you-see-it-now-you-don't missile gap and all.

But in military policy, they have all the rest of us at a disadvantage because, unless you are privy to monumental defense secrets, it is impossible to follow the esoteric IBM-machine logic on which their arguments are based. Only time will tell. If we are not wiped out in a nuclear war, they are right. If we are, they are wrong.

In civil rights, it is a different matter. We are all intimately involved in the dilemma and, one way or another, we are going to work our way out of it. Precipitate Government fiat, issued without debate or congressional action or court decisions, will not work, not the way we do things in this country.

Moreover, it is unfair and unwise to confront communities which are trying to solve the civil rights problem with the overwhelming power of the U.S. Military Establishment. The Gesell report even went so far as to recommend economic reprisal—removal of the military base from a community which refused to cooperate. McNamara rejected this as not "a feasible action at this time," but he left dangling the threat that it might be considered feasible at some later time.

Above and beyond all this, there is the grave constitutional question of the division of power through checks and balances. If the President can do this, of what use is Congress?

One is reminded of the recent warning by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican of Maine, against what she called "the ever-increasing pattern of those forces which would discredit and undermine public confidence in Congress until it is driven to complete subjugation and subservience to the President."

Cuban Raid on British Cay Is Bold Act of Aggression and Disgrace to U.S. Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent kidnapping of 19 Cuban refugees from the British island, Anguilla Cay, by Castro forces, the Fort Lauderdale News, an outstanding Florida newspaper, branded the kidnapping as a bold act of aggression. I must concur in this position, and stress the need for a firm policy toward Cuba by the United States in the event that any similar incident should occur again.

The Secretary of State said in his news conference last week that the United States was concerned over this incident, and that it was discussing measures that might be taken to protect Cuban refugees from any similar situation in the future. I hope that this can be accomplished, and if Castro's agents attempt another similar act of aggression, then the United States should act to insure the safety of any Cuban refugees involved.

A copy of the Fort Lauderdale News editorial on this matter that appeared in that newspaper on August 18, 1963, is entered at this point in the Record:

CUBAN RAID ON BRITISH CAY IS BOLD ACT OF AGGRESSION AND DISGRACE TO U.S. HONOR

In the light of last week's kidnapping of 19 Cuban refugees from the British island of

1963

Anguilla Cay by armed militiamen from Cuba, we think the American people are entitled to ask how long our weak-hearted policymakers are going to procrastinate about taking firm action to stop this sort of thing.

The sad part of this kidnaping episode is that it was conducted in full view of American military forces who, according to a State Department spokesman, were helpless to intervene because the action was taking place on British territory.

Presumably, we have a contract with the British which calls for our military and Coast Guard patrols to keep an eye on islands owned by the British to prevent their being used as bases from which Cuban exiles could launch attacks against Communist Cuba.

Assumedly, also, if our patrols noted evidence that any of these islands, or cays, were being used for that purpose we would immediately contact British authorities so they could take quick steps to prevent such attacks.

But what is our procedure if our patrols happen to find Cuban forces invading these islands, contrary to all principles of international law, and carting refugees forcibly back to Cuba under threat of immediate death if they resist?

This is exactly what happened last week, and to the consternation of a great number of our people, our patrolling forces not only didn't intervene to stop a clear violation of international law, but they didn't even notify British authorities of the incident until it was far too late to prevent the kidnaping.

Supposedly, we have pledged not to permit Fidel Castro to engage in any kind of military action outside of Cuba. Yet, what does one call an armed excursion by two Cuban gunboats and a helicopter into British territorial waters and onto a British-owned island for the express purpose of seizing Cuban refugees and taking them against their will back to Cuba?

If this isn't an act of armed aggression, what is it? And if we are not pledged to resist such an action by all the forces at our command, then the Kennedy administration stands guilty of once against soft-soaping the American people about its Cuban policy, if there is such a thing.

More and more it seems that what we are committed to is nothing more than protecting Fidel Castro and his Communist regime rather than helping Cuban refugees and exiles overthrow it and bring freedom back to their homeland.

We have always been under the impression that when a person witnesses a law being broken, he is justified in doing what he can to stop the infraction even if it is nothing more than notifying the proper authorities that a law is being broken and they should hasten to stop it.

Doesn't this principle also apply to international law or have we become so afraid of offending Castro and his Russian buddies that we are no longer even willing to make a pretense of coming to the aid of innocent people he is going out of his own territory to seize and punish?

The refugees whom the Cuban militiamen kidnaped last week had made their escape from Cuba and had reached the territory of a free nation. Castro's armed forces had no more right to land on Anguilla Cay and seize them than they would have to invade the Florida Keys and seize any Cubans they could find there.

Yet, even though we witnessed this entire incident from the air and even summoned Air Force and Navy fighter planes to provide cover for the Coast Guard seaplane which originally discovered what was going on, we did nothing to prevent the refugees from being kidnaped. What's even more disgraceful and unexplainable, we apparently made no effort to alert British authorities to the fact their territory was being violated until it was much too late to help the victims of Castro's law-breaking foray.

In the words of the State Department we were "helpless" because it wasn't our territory that was being invaded. Even though we saw a crime being committed we couldn't stop it because to do so would make us guilty of breaking international law in the eyes of our befuddled State Department.

Who, we might ask, would charge us with breaking the law? Would it be the British whose territorial rights we would have been protecting? We doubt that. Would it have been Fidel Castro? Quite probably, but what position would he have been in to protest when his forces were clearly in the process of committing an aggressive act against a territorial possession of one of our allies? Would it have been the Russians? Quite probably, also, but what position would they have been in when they have supplied Castro with the arms and the equipment which makes this kind of aggression possible to begin with?

The facts of this incident clearly indicate we could have prevented this kidnaping if we had wanted to do so. But, apparently, our fearful diplomats again didn't want to rock the boat, so 19 more people who sought freedom from Communist tyranny and thought they had won it, have found out our noble words in their behalf mean little when they have to be translated into action.

JACK W. GORE.

Taking Uncle Sam for Granted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a thoughtful article appearing in the New York Times of August 18, the distinguished columnist, James Reston, has made a number of important observations regarding the Western Alliance.

In brief, Mr. Reston has cited the "disturbing" contrast between the thinking of our Government and those of our Western European Allies:

The widely held assumption in West Europe is that Europe can be both protectionist and prosperous, self-sufficient economically and dependent on the United States militarily, and that Washington will go on putting 11 percent of its gross national product into defense and foreign aid while some of the allies are doing less than half as much proportionately.

As Mr. Reston has so correctly stated:

The growing domestic problems of race, unemployment, housing, and transportation in America, plus the increasing competition with a prosperous Europe for the export markets of the world, are bound one day to force a reappraisal. The only question is when this reappraisal will come, and whether it will come under calm circumstances, as now, when it might be controlled, or under urgent and emotional circumstances, when it could get out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, these are significant questions and I commend this excellent article to our colleagues' attention.

The article follows:

HOW TO TAKE UNCLE SAM FOR GRANTED
 (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 17.—The condition of the Western alliance is worse than it seems. For while the alliance has succeeded in re-

lieving the fear of major war in Europe, it rests on the dubious assumption that the United States will continue indefinitely to carry the present share of the burden.

The contrast between the thinking at the top of the Government here and the thinking at the top of the governments in Western Europe is disturbing. The leaders in London and Bonn increasingly talk as if they were spectators rather than participants in the conflict between the giant nations.

Britons see nothing odd in the fact that America should conscript its men to defend Europe while Britain has not only abandoned conscription but is hoping to bring its army back from Germany.

The widely held assumption in West Europe is that Europe can be both protectionist and prosperous, self-sufficient economically and dependent on the United States militarily, and that Washington will go on putting 11 percent of its gross national product into defense and foreign aid while some of the Allies are doing less than half as much proportionately.

How this attitude of mind developed in Europe is clear enough. In the early postwar years of poverty and reconstruction, Western Europe not only came to rely on the United States but gradually accepted the idea that power in the modern world had become proportional to mass, and therefore that only gross material size (population, area and raw materials) could be effective in world politics. There is now less evidence of poverty and unemployment anywhere in Western Europe than in many parts of the United States but this attitude persists and, what is more disturbing, seems to be growing.

De Gaulle is an exception. He at least is challenging the assumption of permanent dependence on the United States. Unfortunately, he is doing it in such a way as to break the movement toward European unity and Atlantic partnership.

ADENAUER'S LECTURE

The presumption of some of the European leaders is astonishing. Chancellor Adenauer lectured Secretary of Defense McNamara the other day in Bonn for 53 minutes on the dangers of a nuclear test ban treaty before ever listening to McNamara's assurances that Germany's interests would be protected.

De Gaulle's reaction to President Kennedy's oblique offer of nuclear help was an immediate rejection. And the Macmillan government, having contributed to the muddle in the European unity movement by its delays in trying to join the Common Market, is now hampering the movement toward Atlantic partnership by refusing to go along with Kennedy's proposal for an international mixed-crew surface navy.

All this is gradually but persistently eroding the confidence of leaders here in Washington in the idea of an effective Atlantic partnership. It is not the traditional critics of Western Europe here who are most upset, but Europe's best friends: Kennedy, Rusk, George Ball and influential Senators such as FULBRIGHT, MANSFIELD, and HUMPHREY.

It may seem paradoxical to emphasize this imbalance in the alliance just at the moment when the Soviets show signs of accepting a European balance of power based on NATO. But before the new generation of leaders comes to power in Europe, the dangers in the present European set of assumptions had better be discussed.

The Kennedy administration does not make a major issue of all this now, partly because the present system of defense seems to be working fairly well, partly because Europe is going through a period of political instability and transition, and partly because it fears Western Europe might not generate enough self-discipline to make a greater effort, even if Washington announced a policy of gradual withdrawal.

Yet the growing domestic problems of race, unemployment, housing, and transportation

August 20

in America, plus the increasing competition with a prosperous Europe for the export markets of the world, are bound one day to force a reappraisal.

The only question is when this reappraisal will come, and whether it will come under calm circumstances, as now, when it might be controlled, or under urgent and emotional circumstances, when it could get out of hand.

Children Pawns in Civil Rights Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled, "Suffer, Little Children," which appeared in the News of Lynchburg, Va., on August 13. The News is one of the finest and most widely read papers in the State of Virginia. It is published by Col. Carter Glass III, and the Honorable Thomas R. Glass, able and courageous grandsons of the late, distinguished, highly respected, and beloved U.S. Senator Carter Glass of Virginia.

The editorial is as follows:

SUFFER, LITTLE CHILDREN

We are haunted by the eyes of little children.

The wide, dumb eyes of the little Negro child whimpering as its mother clutches him in her arms and lies down before the wheels of a truck.

The fearful eyes of the young Negro boys and girls not yet in their teens as they clasp hands at the command of an adult and block the entrance of a construction site.

The apprehensive eyes of half a school transported miles from their neighborhood world to be herded into strange classrooms. The uneasy eyes watching their arrival, equally apprehensive of this "invasion" from another heritage.

These are the helpless pawns of the political and sociological prejudices of their parents and the so-called white "men of good will" who are using them for fodder in their racial war.

We are haunted by the wide, dumb, fearful eyes of these little human weapons wielded by men and women of both races with complete disregard of the aftermath.

Do they realize, their parents, the "men of good will," what it is they are doing to these little children, black and white alike?

Do they realize they are planting the seeds of hostility—which were not there in the first place—in the breasts of a whole generation?

Do they realize that they are emphasizing differences instead of eradicating them? Do they realize that to be different is not wrong but it is wrong to think so, and the thought is theirs, not their children's?

Do they realize that they are providing their children with a fresh and deep-rooted grievance which will fan the flames of racial passions for decades to come?

Not since the Crusades have little children been so sacrificed upon the altar of their parents' misguided aims. The world still censures the parents of that time for the unmentionable miseries which befell the children's army.

What sort of parent is it that will place his child in jeopardy? What parent is it

that will consent to the use of his child's life as an experiment?

These are the eyes of little children in New York, St. Louis, and New Jersey. Theirs is the heritage of feelings which the North founded in the South, come home now and being recognized.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, after our valiant struggle for freedom is America to lose the cold war because, stirred by Kennedy administration propaganda, the people are failing to remember the real objective of Communist Russia, our destruction? This may be tragically so.

Lest we forget that Communist Russia has not given up its goal and that its primary purpose is still to disarm and make effective the only deterrent to its march to world conquest, the United States, I include as a part of these remarks, the following column by Dr. Robert Morris, educator and authority on the Communist conspiracy. Dr. Morris reminds us that we are not playing games, but are dealing with the life and death of the United States of America.

The article follows:

BASKETBALL IS DEAN RUSK'S GAME

(By Robert Morris)

The observation of Secretary of State Dean Rusk after losing badly at badminton to Nikita Khrushchev on the latter's own oriental rug at the Black Sea resort of Garga, "that basketball is my game" is so characteristic of our foreign policy over the last 20 years.

We have been playing the Communists' game, with their rules, and on their side of the playing field. As a result we have been trounced time and time again. We are being trounced in the present disarmament negotiations that have reached the first stage of implementation with the test ban treaty.

Disarmament to Khrushchev is a weapon of conquest. He has said so many times. On January 16 of this year in East Germany he said:

"Disarmament, primarily means dismantling the gigantic war machines of the highly developed countries. . . . General disarmament does not mean disarming the peoples fighting for national liberation. On the contrary, it would deprive the imperialists of the means to halt progress and crush the struggle for independence."

Unfortunately it is not a game that we are playing but instead a life and death struggle with a perfidious foe who is determined to subjugate us.

So much damage has already been done that it is imperative that we look down the road where all this is leading, before it is too late.

The end of the road is clearly marked. The particularly frank Walt W. Rostow our chief policy planner has spelled it out for us in his volume "The United States in the World Arena":

"It is the legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations including the United States, the right to use

substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this residual right is the right of national sovereignty and the basis for the existence of an international arena of power, it is, therefore an American interest to see an end of nationhood as it has been historically defined."

The route to be taken toward this goal is "disarmament." The disarmament aspect is only incidental, though and the means to achieve Mr. Rostow's goal. As everyone should know our disarmament policy, fixed and affirmed by the President himself is to work for the dismantling, in three stages of our defense establishment and the creation of an all-powerful world organization in which we would be an insignificant minority of 1 in 126. It would clearly mean the end of the United States as we have known it.

The test ban treaty is only the "first step" down this road according to Secretary Rusk himself before the Senate on March 11, 1963.

This has been on the road signs since the same Walt W. Rostow at the Pugwash Conference in Moscow in December 1960 called for: "Completion of test ban negotiations which should build confidence and open the way to the step beyond."

The press tells that U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations and as such top man at the control tower, just happens to be standing at a roadstand with a disarmament treaty in his pocket.

This presumes that all the Communists from Nikita Khrushchev, Andrei Gromyko to Gus Hall here in the United States, flushed as they are with successes, will renounce their work of a lifetime, with all its dedication and sacrifices and adopt in a short time what we call an international rule of law but which to them is hated bourgeois way of life.

Mr. Rostow and Mr. Rusk should be told we are not playing games.

A Talk With Ira Hirschmann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great humanitarians of our country is Ira Hirschmann. He has been in the business of helping people for many, many years. In its August issue the National Jewish Monthly published the following interview with Mr. Hirschmann which I commend to the attention of our colleagues:

A TALK WITH IRA HIRSCHMANN—THE MAN WHO SAVED THOUSANDS OF JEWS DURING WORLD WAR II IS TODAY HELPING REHABILITATE THOUSANDS OF ARAB REFUGEES

(By Jean R. Herschaft)

The 8- by 10-inch photograph of Gamal Abdel Nasser in full military attire is personally autographed "with best wishes and highest regards." That the Egyptian chief of state gave this photo as a token of friendship to a dedicated American may not seem newsworthy—but the fact that the man is a dedicated Jew is astounding.

The place where this friendly overture occurred is even more unbelievable: the Nasser home in the suburbs of Cairo. There, in 1960, for over 2½ hours Nasser was gracious host to a man he knew to be a Jew—one responsible for saving thousands of Jewish lives during World War II as an American